

REMARKS

Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of this application as so amended is requested. By this amendment Applicants have canceled claim 6 and replaced it with an identical claim 8. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 remain in the case.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodriguez, stating that Rodriguez teaches a rack-mounting system (Fig. 2). Applicants submit that Rodriguez does not teach a rack-mounting system, but rather a digital computer chassis 12 for a computer unit 20, the chassis having a bottom, a front wall 17, a rear wall 18 and a strut 15 (not a rib or a central wall) fastened to both the front and rear walls to strengthen the chassis.

The Examiner further states Rodriguez teaches a frame (top, bottom and side walls of 20) forming a central compartment (entire inside of housing 20) forming a central compartment (entire inside of housing 20). Applicants submit that Rodriguez does not show a top or sides for the chassis, but rather only a bottom and front and back walls so that no compartment is formed "having a top, a bottom and two sides" without adding the cover 26.

The Examiner then states that Rodriguez has a sleeve (indicated by "a" on Attachment A) adapted to receive an instrument and fit into the compartment (conceivably anywhere inside the frame per revised Attachment A). It is true that "a" may be a sleeve for receiving the floppy disk drives 25, but Applicants submit that "a" does not fit into a compartment that has a top, bottom and two sides unless the cover is put on. Rather "a" fits in an open area of the chassis that has a bottom and conceivably front and back walls, but no top (assuming that the front and back walls

arguably might be considered to be equivalent to the claimed side walls). The sleeve cannot be inserted into the “compartment having a top, a bottom and two sides” once the cover is put on, but only before such a compartment is formed.

Finally the Examiner states that Rodriguez has means for detachably securing the sleeve within the frame (“b”, “c” of Attachment A). Applicants submit that it is not clear that “b” and “c” (which appear to be a “hook and eye” attachment means) are designed for detachably mounting the sleeve onto the chassis, but rather appear to be for an essentially permanent mounting, especially once the cover is put on to form the “compartment” by completing the “frame.”

Applicants submit that the only way to form a compartment in Rodriguez “having a top, a bottom and two sides” is to enclose the chassis with the cover 26 to form the computer unit. However such a configuration is not rack-mountable, i.e., “suitable for mounting on an instrument rack.” Such a “frame” by Rodriguez formed by the housing results in a compartment to the one side of the front wall. But then the sleeve “a”, which has to be mounted prior to putting on the housing, is not detachably mounted in the frame until the housing is removed, destroying the compartment as recited by Applicants. Therefore claim 1 is deemed to be allowable as being neither anticipated nor rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by Rodriguez.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-6/4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez (claim 4) in view of Noda et al (“Noda”) and Ryan et al (“Ryan”) (claims 2, 5, 6/4) or in view of Russo (claim 3). For the reasons recited in the previous response by Applicants, and because these claims depend from claim 1, deemed to be allowable, claims 2-4/6 also are deemed to be allowable.


The Examiner noted that claim 6 depended from a later claim as well as prior claims. To remedy this error, claim 6 has been renumbered as claim 8 by canceling claim 6 and rewriting it as claim 8 so that it depends only from prior claims.

The Examiner objected to claims 6/5, 6/7 (now claims 8/5, 8/7) and 7 as depending from a rejected base claim. However Applicants submit that these claims are allowable in their present form as depending from an allowable base claim, as indicated above.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested. Should the Examiner maintain the rejections of claims 1-6/4 (1-5 and 8/4), entry of this amendment is requested as placing the case in better form for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT D. KLUSER et al

By 
Francis I. Gray
Reg. No. 27,788
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)
Beaverton, OR 97077
(503) 627-7261

7201 US